

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 1, 2010, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 18, 23 and 28 have been amended in the present paper. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-20, 22-28 and 32 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration, entry of the amendments and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim 14

Applicants note that no basis for rejection has been provided for claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request an indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claim 14.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-13, 15-20, 22-28 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0210440, hereinafter Hiroyasu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,363,089, hereinafter Goldenberg and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0025827 to Song, hereinafter Song. Applicants traverse.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that the Office Action rejects claims 1, 4-13, 15-20, 22-28 and 32 as being *anticipated* by prior art; however, the Office Action relies upon multiple references for support and even provides a reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the multiple references in the asserted manner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) because each and every feature of the rejected claims is not taught by a single reference (as conceded by the Office Action (see, e.g., p. 3)).

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

a first connecting member for connecting to the first rotatable body member of the handheld electronic device for rotation around a first axis; and
a second connecting member connected to the second bracket for rotation of said second bracket around a second axis, said first and second axes being spaced apart and parallel to each other,

wherein said second bracket comprises a third connecting member for connecting to the second rotatable body member of the handheld electronic device

for rotation around a third axis, said third axis being perpendicular to said first and second axes, and

wherein said first bracket further comprises a fourth connecting member for connecting to a third rotatable body member of the handheld electronic device, the fourth connecting member enabling the third rotatable body member to rotate about a fourth rotational axis perpendicular to the first and second axes, wherein the first bracket further allows the third rotatable body member to rotate about the first axis independently of the first rotatable body member

None of the cited documents, taken either separately or in combination, teaches or suggests such features. The Office Action at p. 4 asserts a combination of the body section of Hiroyasu as a first rotatable body member, the display section as a second rotatable body member (by way of Goldenberg's hinge) and the antenna of Song as a third rotatable body member. Even assuming, without conceding, that the above noted combination is valid, the combination still fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. For example, nowhere do any of the documents teach or suggest a third rotatable body member being rotatable about the first axis independently of the first rotatable body member. Even using the combination asserted by the Office Action at p. 4, Song's antenna (i.e., the alleged third body member) is not able to rotate along either of the parallel axes of Goldenberg independently of the body member or display member. That is, rotation of the antenna along one of the parallel axes would require movement of the corresponding member (e.g., body member or display member). Indeed, the only independent axis of rotation of the antenna is axis defined by pivot 206 (see, e.g., FIG. 11 of Song). Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent claim 28 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claim 28 is distinguishable from Hiroyasu for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 4-13, 15-20, 22-27, and 32 are distinguishable from Hiroyasu for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 28. Furthermore, claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, wherein the first bracket is a H-shaped bracket comprising a cross-piece and four lobes, said lobes being perpendicular to said cross-piece, each lobe having a circular hole for mounting the first bracket on an outer surface of a boss, wherein the first bracket connects four bosses

together. In its rejection, the Office Action merely cites “cited portions of Goldenberg and Hiroyasu, Figure 5.” P. 6. However, none of these citations describe any H-shaped brackets having four lobes and a cross-piece. Even assuming, without conceding, that element 73 or 74 of Hiroyasu describes a bracket with a cross-bar, Hiroyasu still lacks a teaching or suggestion that the bracket includes 4 lobes. At most, each of elements 73 and 74 include two lobes apiece. None of the other cited documents cure this deficiency of Hiroyasu. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: July 1, 2010

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/

Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001